

EQUAL RIGHTS

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

Vol. 30, No. 9

DECEMBER, 1944

The Library
Congress
Serial 11606

JAN 3 1945

Copy 1

Present Situation Regarding The Equal Rights Amendment

By GERTRUDE GATES

Chairman, Women's Joint Legislative Committee for Equal Rights

IT will be recalled that Congress reconvened November 14, 1944, after the recess taken for the elections. It will also be recalled that the Equal Rights Amendment is now on the Senate calendar awaiting a vote, and that a pledge was given by Senator Alben W. Barkley, Majority Leader, on September 19, 1944, that he would cooperate with Senator Gillette in bringing the Amendment before the Senate for a vote. Senator Barkley said in this connection, in a speech on the floor of the Senate: "I am sure that without undue delay and long before the legislatures in the 45 states in which legislatures will meet in January and February of the coming year, or at least early in the year, which will be the earliest possible date upon which any legislature could take action, the U. S. Senate will have acted in ample time for the House to take such action as it may see fit to take." (Speech, Sept. 19, 1944.)

However, Senator Barkley failed to mention the Amendment in his statement on the contemplated legislative program when Congress reconvened, November 14. Senator Vandenberg thereupon raised the question, as quoted in an excerpt from the Congressional Record of Thursday, November 16, 1944:

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his statement. My interest was inspired chiefly in respect to knowing what was the plan relative to submitting the equal-rights amendment to the Senate, quite regardless of one's attitude toward the proposed amendment. My attitude will be disclosed when I vote on it, and not before then.

However, regardless of one's attitude, when a large body of the people of the country endorse such a proposed constitutional amendment and when the leaders of both parties have endorsed it, it seems to me that the advocates of such a measure are at least entitled to a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate, without much more delay.

Mr. BARKLEY. I feel the same way about it. Of course, we cannot assume responsibility here for what may happen in another body. I will state, because I always try to be frank with the Senate and with all persons who are interested in a measure of any kind, that I myself am ready to vote on the proposed amendment at any time when it can be brought up, and I hope it can be brought up in the very near future and can be considered by the Senate.

It would not be the first time that one body had passed a measure which the other body had not considered at the session at which it was passed. Frequently we have seen even amendments to the Constitution of the United States passed by the Senate before they were taken up in the House. Therefore, I do not feel myself obligated by the knowledge or information, and so I am not responsible for it. We are responsible only for our own actions in the Senate. It is my hope that at a very early date we can take up in the Senate the matter to which reference has been made and dispose of it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his statement. As the Senator from Kentucky knows, the able Senator from Iowa (Mr. Gillette) is the sponsor of the amendment, and I

should like to see him have an opportunity at some time during the final weeks of his service to present the proposal to the Senate. I repeat that I am withholding my own judgment pending the debates, and I am not advocating this step for any reason of partisan affiliation for or against the movement. I think, in fair play, that the time has come when there are very few excuses left to justify a failure to permit a vote upon the proposal. I am sure the Senator agrees with me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree.

Mr. GILLETTE subsequently said: Mr. President, there has been on the Senate calendar for some months a joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to the so-called equal-rights status of men and women. The resolution was sponsored in the Senate by some 22 or 23 Senators, in addition to myself. Shortly before the recent recess of Congress, in September, as I recall, I had given notice on the floor of the Senate of my intention to call up the measure for consideration by the Senate. After consultation with the leadership on the respective sides of the aisle, it seemed unwise to attempt to obtain consideration of the measure at that time because of the difficulty of obtaining a quorum, inasmuch as so many Members of the Senate were then absent from the city. Consequently, those of us who were interested in the measure thought it best to let its consideration be postponed until after the election. At that time I gave my word that I would move to call it up at the first opportunity.

I understand that a short time ago during the session of today the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan (Mr. Vandenberg) in a colloquy with the majority leader brought up this question. I have since consulted with both the majority leader and the minority leader. They have always been very cooperative. I wish now to state, for the information of the Senate, that it is my intention again to move to have the joint resolution taken up for consideration by the Senate at the earliest possible moment the legislative program of the Senate will permit. I simply have requested recognition at this time so that the statement I have made may appear in the Record for the information of the Senate.

Following these declarations and assurances on the floor of the Senate, the Women's Joint Legislative Committee for Equal Rights began active work to secure the passage of the Amendment by the Senate before the close of the present Congress. This Committee is made up of twenty-seven national associations that have come together in a joint committee to support the constitutional amendment for Equal Rights.

On December 3, the Committee met in Washington to plan the next steps in securing the passage of the Amendment. The following letter, listing the organizations and pointing out the public support the Amendment enjoys, was sent on December 4, to each Senator.

To the Senators of the 78th Congress:

"The organization of the Women's Joint Legislative Committee for Equal Rights, consisting of more than three million members,

(Continued on Page 78)

Equal Rights



Official Organ
of the
NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY
Capitol Hill Washington, D. C.

Phone Atlantic 1210
Published Monthly at
144 B Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.
Entered as second class matter at the post-
office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of
March 3, 1879

Subscription, \$1.50 a Year
Foreign Subscription, \$1.50

ANNA KELTON WILEY Editor
DORA G. OGLE Business Manager

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

ALMA LUTZ **INEZ HAYNES IRWIN**
EDITH HOUGHTON HOOKER **HELEN ROBBINS BITTERMANN**
MIRIAM E. OATMAN, Ph. D.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

The National Council of the N. W. P. consists of the officers, past Chairmen, the Chairman of each of the State and Territory branches and the D. C., the Chairmen of the Occupational Councils and twenty Members at Large.

NATIONAL OFFICERS

Chairman, Alice Paul, N. J.
1st Vice-Chairman, Clara Snell Wolfe, Ohio
2nd Vice-Chairman, Margaret C. Williams, Conn.
3d Vice-Chairman, Jane Norman Smith, Vt.
Treasurer, Laura M. Berrien, Ga.
Secretary, Dr. Margaret Seabee, D. C.

Mrs. Ethel Adamson, N. J.
Mrs. Nina Allender, Ill.
Mrs. Estelle Bjerg, Ariz.
Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy, Va.
Mrs. Lois Buensell, Pa.
Mrs. Rosa Cunningham, Iowa
Mrs. Serena Foley Davis, Pa.
Mrs. Elisabeth Forbes, Md.
Miss Edith Goode, Vt.
Mrs. Dorothy Shipley Granger, Md.
Mrs. Rebecca Greathouse, La.

Mrs. U. S. Guyer, Kan.
Miss Alma Lutz, Mass.
Mrs. Burnita Shelton Matthews, D. C.
Mrs. Charles L. McNary, Ore.
Mrs. Ferlie S. Mesta, Ariz.
Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, Pa.
Miss Anita Pollitzer, S. C.
Miss Doris Stevens, N. Y.
Mrs. Helen Hunt West, Fla.
Mrs. Anna Kelton Wiley, D. C.
Mrs. Lucy Rice Winkler, Cal.

NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

OBJECT

To secure for women complete equality with men under the law and in all human relationships—in particular to secure the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress and the several States shall have power within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This amendment shall take effect five years after the date of ratification."

*The star shines on for those with eyes to see,
A finite gleam toward all infinity.*

ELEANOR A. E. CHAFFEE.

Latest Bulletin

The 78th Congress came to an end Tuesday, December 19, 1944, without action on the Equal Rights Amendment. The 79th Congress will convene January 3, 1945.

Immediately after the adjournment of Congress a number of Senators expressed their regret that the Congress had adjourned without the passage of the Amendment and offered to act as sponsors for the Amendment in the new Senate. Those who have already agreed to serve in this way are: Senators Austin (R) of Vermont, Capper (R) of Kansas, Guffey (D) of Pennsylvania, Hawkes (R) of New Jersey, Johnson (R) of California, Pepper (D) of Florida, Radcliffe (D) of Maryland, Robertson (R) of Wyoming, Thomas (D) of Oklahoma, Tunnell (D) of Delaware, Tydings (D) of Maryland.

Situation Regarding The Amendment

(Continued from First Page)

unite in urging you to vote for the submission of the Equal Rights Amendment now before the Senate, and to do your utmost to secure its immediate passage.

"Each of the major political party platforms includes an Equal Rights Amendment plank.

"Twenty-seven State Governors have wholeheartedly endorsed the Amendment.

"Thirty-one national women's organizations, including the largest and most influential in the country, have given, by conventions or referendum, their endorsement to the proposed Equal Rights Amendment.

"In addition, many thousands of thoughtful men and women who are not affiliated with any organized group that has endorsed the Amendment, have also by personal signature recorded their own individual support. Opponents of the Amendment are for the most part the same groups who predicted that dire consequences would follow the extension of suffrage to women.

"Since in peace and in war, women equally with men create and sustain the national well-being, we urge you to take immediate action toward establishing in our national constitution equality of rights under the law without denial or abridgment on account of sex.

(Signed) "GERTRUDE S. GATES, *Chairman*;
"DOROTHY M. SPINKS, *Secretary*;
"KATHARINE A. NORRIS, *Convenor*;

"On behalf of General Federation of Women's Clubs, National Education Association of the United States, National Woman's Party, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, St. Joan's Society, National Association of Colored Women, American Alliance of Civil Service Women, National Association of Women Lawyers, American Medical Women's Association, Association of American Women Dentists, Osteopathic Women's National Association, National Council of Women Chiropractors, American Woman's Society of Certified Public Accountants, American Society of Women Accountants, We the Mothers, Mobilize for America; Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Mary Ball Washington Association of America, American Federation of Soroptimist Clubs, Pilot International, Alpha Iota Sorority, Mothers and Women of America, Avalon National Poetry Shrine, American Council for Equal Legal Status, National Association of Women, Wheel of Progress, Industrial Women's League for Equality."

The above letter was taken personally by members of our Joint Committee to the offices of the ninety-six Senators. Nearly all of the Senators were interviewed by members of our Committee.

Since the 78th Congress is still in session, as this is written, we cannot know what the final outcome will be. But the Woman's Joint Committee for Equal Rights believes that, having come almost to the point of victory in the Senate during this session, there is no question but that the Equal Rights Amendment will pass the Senate in the next Congress, with little delay.

The Amendment is still in Committee stage in the House of Representatives. We look for speedy and favorable action by the next House of Representatives because of the platform pledges of both Parties.

However, one thing is certain, there is an interesting period of stimulating activity ahead for us in successfully achieving our aims.

More Endorsements

ERNEST A. HOOTON

Professor of Anthropology, Harvard University

I certainly oppose any effort on the part of the male to repress or dominate women by legal enactments. If the Equal Rights Amendment is designed to put an end to statutory discrimination against your sex, I certainly favor it.

ELIE CHARLIER EDSON

Writer, Lecturer, Teacher

In these days of enlightenment along so many lines, it is amazing that any man should not expect his wife, his mother, or his sister, to enjoy with him equal legal rights. Fortunately girls in coeducational colleges have come, like war-workers of their sex, to expect equal rights. Pioneers have shown the way.

Many of the social welfare workers, who in their youth achieved some excellent social legislation for women, still seek to preserve their handiwork—protection for women—as originally enacted; but new times and conditions demand cooperation and not competition between the sexes. Special legislation can be extended to both sexes when needed.

Due to the heroic efforts of women, for almost a century, the new generation is no longer completely weighted down by the dead hand of man-made laws. Women in the United States now have 60% of the votes. They certainly are entitled to equality under the law. The Constitutional Amendment, which would establish this, should be submitted by Congress to the States for ratification now. Women deserve equality. It is ludicrous to deny them equal legal rights in a democracy we proudly acclaim as our way of life.

The Associated Credit Women's Breakfast Clubs of Florida unanimously endorsed the Equal Rights Amendment at their State meeting held in Orlando, Florida, on October 22, 1944.

SHIRLEY ELLIOTT, *Secretary.*

ALBERT W. HAWKES

United States Senator from New Jersey

December 19, 1944.

When the Equal Rights Amendment was introduced in the 78th Congress, January 1943, I agreed to be one of the twenty-three sponsors. I shall be happy to be a sponsor for the Amendment again in the next Congress. I hope that victory for the Amendment will come in the new Congress, without delay.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT W. HAWKES.

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

United States Senator from Maryland

December 18, 1944.

I am honored and pleased to be invited to serve as a Sponsor for the Equal Rights Amendment in the next Congress, convening on January 3rd. It is my belief that there are now enough supporters in the Senate to give the required two-thirds majority.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE.

DWIGHT H. GREEN

Governor of Illinois

November 11, 1944.

Passage by Congress and ratification by the states of a constitutional amendment providing equal rights for men and women as recommended in the Republican National Platform would serve the just and very valuable purpose of ending discriminations against women that may now exist in certain states. As such I recommend its earnest consideration by the next Congress, whose actions without doubt will be directed along principles for which the Republican Party stands.

As a state in which citizens of both sexes enjoy equal privileges and as a state whose General Assembly enacted a law which I was very glad to sign and which provides equal pay for equal work for women, Illinois doubtless would ratify such a constitutional amendment.

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT W. GREEN, *Governor.*

ARTHUR CAPPER

United States Senator from Kansas

December 18, 1944.

I deeply regret that the Equal Rights Amendment has run into hard luck from the legislative standpoint. This is a great disappointment to me, as well as to you. I have been strong for the Amendment ever since it was first introduced by my friend, Senator Curtis of Kansas.

It will be necessary to resume the fight in the next session and you can count on my best efforts at that time. We came very close to final success in the Congress that is just ending and I believe that we will succeed completely in the new Congress.

Cordially yours,

ARTHUR CAPPER.

JOHN R. MURDOCK

Member House of Representatives from Arizona

I have been favorable to the Equal Rights Amendment all along, and I am favorable now, so that I promise you that I will do what I can toward its enactment. This attitude has been expressed heretofore, and it is probably pretty well known among my constituents. I am well pleased with the vote I received on November 7, which I regard as a vote of confidence, and I will say the same thing to my constituents after the election as before, on this point and on all other matters.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. MURDOCK, *M. C.*

MILLARD E. TYDINGS

United States Senator from Maryland

December 19, 1944.

If you arrange for a group sponsorship of the Amendment as you have done in the past, I shall be glad to have you list my name as one of the sponsors.

Sincerely yours,

M. E. TYDINGS.

(Continued on Page 82)

Madame President

By VIRGINIA YERBY MCNEILL

HAS woman special characteristics that particularly fit her for the Presidency?

Prof. Ernest A. Hooton, noted Harvard University anthropologist, believes that she has. "I look forward to a time," he says, "when a woman will be sitting in the Presidential office of the White House."

The opinion voiced by this authority, who has startled his countrymen from time to time with his sometimes amusing, always unexpected, pronouncements on humanity, has evoked a variety of responses from fellow scientists as well as interested the man in the street.

"As a professional student of man," Dr. Hooton recently wrote in the *Harvard Service News*, "I judge that females of our species have certain qualities that ought to render them superior to males in statesmanship." He emphasized woman's "magnificent forthrightness" and said great statesmanship calls for simplicity. "It requires a perfect transparency of character that does not deviate in thought and action from a course set by the principles of right . . . and to my mind such a character is more common in women than in men."

Credited With "Greater Honesty"

"The greater honesty of women springs from their lesser ability to befuddle their own consciences with specious excuses and fallacious reasoning. Their capacity for moral self-deception is smaller than that of males. They see things black or white and not in the neutral grays of the facile compromiser."

Although some feel that woman is biologically unfitted for such a role, the sum total of the scientific opinion consulted in Baltimore is that "it could happen here"; that it is less a matter of biology and anthropology, than of training and tradition. All scientists interviewed agreed that there have been great leaders among women, some great rulers, but these have been the exception, because woman's education and traditions have not been such as to develop her along these lines. Should woman acquire the necessary training, should she begin to think (and man to think with her) that the Presidential office should be hers — who knows?

Dr. Esther Richards, psychiatrist of Johns Hopkins Hospital, is not inclined to take the Hooton suggestion too seriously, but thinks it is completely possible for a woman to become President. However, she does not think that will come soon.

Woman is the product of her training, Dr. Richards pointed out. Only about 100 years ago, it was believed that higher education would be impossible for women. Their brains would deteriorate, their whole beings change, if they tried to progress beyond the study of the simple graces and a light smattering of the arts. Since then women have made tremendous strides. Their next direction is anybody's guess.

A President, she believes, should be chosen on his record. Should an individual, whether male or female, possess the necessary attributes for public office and leadership, sex should not be important. But no woman has had sufficient training yet, Dr. Richards adds.

"Matter Of The Individual"

Dr. F. G. Evans, anatomist at the University of Maryland, can see no valid anthropological reason why a woman should or should not become President, because she is a woman. "It is entirely a matter of the

individual," he said. The merits of candidates should rest on individual intelligence and training, and not upon whether they were men or women.

Contradiction of Professor Hooton's ideas came from Dr. Robert Seliger, psychiatrist, who said that, although he did not have the full text of the Harvard anthropologist's statement, he was in total disagreement with the conclusions as given in the dispatch concerning it.

"We feel that statesmanship requires controlled emotional approach and clarity of thinking based not on 'simplicity' or forthrightness, but on the ability to 'see whole,' and, as dispassionately as humanly possible, to sift out and discard emotionality and its evidences in other individuals, and to adjust to new situations as they arise in matters of national and international equilibrium." * * *

Dr. Seliger went on to say that men and women alike see life in shades of gray. Moreover, most women, through biological laws, of necessity are more emotional than men, although in individual cases the traits may become mixed. And this greater emotionality, at times, imposes strain and stress, breaking through the controls of intellectual judgment. Sentiment will betray the average woman."

Compromise Likely

"In matters of integrity," Dr. Seliger summed up, "there can be no scientific distinction based on sex alone. It would seem that both sexes have their own techniques of adjusting to external pressures. We are all more apt to be 'facile compromisers' than angels of integrity." * * *

"The professor will have his little joke!" Dr. Erwin H. Ackerknecht, anthropologist and Fellow in the department of history of medicine at Hopkins Medical School, smiled and shrugged deprecatingly. "Probably he has a very nice wife. So have I, but one should not generalize from too few samples. Since I have been so fortunate in my acquisition of a wife and two daughters, I should feel inclined to agree with him, did I not feel compelled, in the interests of scientific truth, to point out that there is absolutely no scientific background for such a statement. As an opinion, that is his business; as scientific fact, it is entirely without anthropological foundation.

"Men and women do have different mental traits, different characteristics, but they depend less on biological differences than on culture and tradition. It is entirely dependent on training." * * *

Dr. Ackerknecht thinks it is absurd to say that women are more emotional than men. "I have known plenty of very emotional men," he said. "Women are not emotionally unstable, or unfitted for most types of work. Women make fine doctors. I have known splendid women surgeons. It is entirely a matter of prejudice and resulting lack of opportunity that so few fields have been open to them. A woman might make a good President, when her training has progressed to that point, neither better nor worse than a man, except in so far as individual capabilities would be concerned."

No Smelling Salts Now

Dr. Ivan E. McDougale, sociologist of Goucher College, suggests that we have never known what a woman was like until recently. "The infinite variability of their occupations has presented them in a new light.

(Continued on Page 86)

In Memoriam

LIDA GUSTAVA HEYMANN . . . 1868-1943
ANITA AUGSPURG 1857-1943

Two Great Leaders of the Movements for Freedom, Social Justice and Peace

By GERTRUDE BAER

FOR about 45 years Anita Augspurg and Lida Gustava Heymann shared their life work, their hopes and the joys of fulfillment, the intense mental suffering from the barbarism of fascism, nazism and war and finally—exile and privation. Lida Gustava Heymann died after severe illness at the age of 75. Anita Augspurg, 86, followed her after five months' time.

Few of her international co-workers and friends suspected in Lida Gustava Heymann the once well sheltered daughter of a wealthy Protestant family of Hamburg. They knew her as the firebrand, always on the side of all victims of injustice. Her social and educational work in the great port, especially the first movement there for the abolition of brothels and of the regulation of prostitution left an enduring impress on the social institutions of the town. Young women trained in the school of Lida Gustava Heymann's movements stood in the front ranks of the women members of Hamburg's municipal body and carried on a bitter and successful struggle enforcing the closing of the brothels of the city after the first World War. Lida Gustava Heymann was a world citizen in the widest sense, complete in the integrity and nobility of her spirit and temperament, magnanimous in what she gave and thought and did, of unbending will and unshakable civic courage.

Anita Augspurg symbolized the hard struggle of a pioneer generation for Freedom, Equality and Right. Hers was an exceptionally rich life. Coming from a Lutheran family in Northwest Germany, in what was then the independent Kingdom of Hanover, she passed the examinations for a teacher, trained for the stage and acted in the great classical theatres of Meiningen, Altenburg, etc., studied law and agriculture and in 1897 took her degree in Zurich, the first German woman to become a Doctor of Laws. She had a pronounced part in formulating important amendments to the German Family Law, amendments improving the legal status of women, which at the turn of the century were being urged by the German woman's movement and she played a prominent part in the fight for their acceptance. Though active since 1886 in the agitation for women's rights in Munich, she concentrated more and more on what she considered the prerequisite for a radical transformation of the position of women in the State—namely their right to vote. Together with Lida Gustava Heymann, who had now moved to Bavaria, she built up a separate German Union for Woman Suffrage and, contrary to the general woman suffrage movement of that time, which advocated votes for women on the same limited terms as men, she stood boldly forth for equal, secret and direct votes for all men and women—demands that were "radical" in the Germany of that day. Suffrage certainly did not "fall into the lap of German women" as has frequently been asserted. The struggle was violent, and fierce were the attacks and calumnies against the movement and its two leaders.

When finally in November, 1918, the first World War was brought to a halt and the new Republic of Bavaria in its first proclamation fully enfranchised all women and men, the two women rejoiced. The first phase of their work was crowned with success, and the flag with the black, red and gold colors of the German Democratic movement of 1848 was proudly flying on the flagstaff of their estate on the hills, high above the Isar Valley, in Upper Bavaria. On that day Lida Gustava Heymann, a citizen of the Free City of Hamburg, boarded a train in that town to return to Bavaria from where—not being Bavarian—she had been expelled early in 1917, because of her refusal to stop working for Freedom and Peace, in spite of war, censorship and repeated warnings from the Bavarian military authorities. Never shall we forget her return to Munich, after days of the most difficult travel, the triumphal welcome given her by women of Bavaria, from all ranks of the population—free citizens for the first time in the history of their country, free citizens of a free Republic eager to thank her and Dr. Augspurg for their outstanding part in the long fight for the attainment of full and equal rights for German women, eager to take over their political duties and obligations. Never shall we forget the evening of that day when thousands of women and men crowded one of the biggest beer halls in Munich to celebrate the end of the war and the political liberation of women. Purple, white, green, the colors of that wing of the German Suffrage Movement which was headed by Dr. Augspurg and L. G. Heymann, flowers, evergreens, pennons and suffrage

banners decked the immense hall. Anita Augspurg, whose beautiful full voice carried like the note of an organ to the furthest hearer, opened the rally with the words: "Men and Women Citizens of the Republic of Bavaria! The War is ended. The Republic has conferred upon all of you, each one of you men and women universal, equal, secret and direct suffrage". Amid tumultuous applause Lida Gustava Heymann arose and began her great speech with the words: "Increased Freedom means Increased Responsibility. . . ."

The work of these two strong and independent German women, their entire lives, were dominated by this consciousness of responsibility. Every speech—and how many thousands they delivered all over Germany and abroad—every political activity, every issue of their news organs bears the mark of this. "Woman Suffrage" and later the monthly "The Woman in the State" (Die Frau im Staat) which they owned and edited from 1918 until they became exiles in 1933, were two important channels of their influence. Political suffrage was, in their eyes, only a first step, only a weapon in the fight for their wider goals: the attainment of political, economic and social conditions which would guarantee the dignity of the human personality to every man and woman. Democracy was their fundamental creed. In boundless devotion they toiled day and night to arouse German women to educate themselves for the exercise of political power, to remind them again and again that the rights and liberties firmly established by the 1919 Constitution of the German Republic were also fundamental duties.

As they had consistently maintained their stand against the war in their own country from 1914 to 1918, so they stood against civil war when it broke out in Germany. When "white" and "red" troops stood facing one another in Bavaria it was the proposal of Anita Augspurg and Lida Gustava Heymann that women went to the military leaders and induced them to agree not to fire on one another. When the "white" troops marched through Thuringia to North Germany, the two women asked women members of the Jena Municipality to persuade the workers in this factory city to keep off the streets and thus to deprive the "white" troops of any pretext for shooting.

When at the beginning of the twenties Hitler began his "putsches" Anita Augspurg and Lida Gustava Heymann, with some of their co-workers, demanded from the head of the Bavarian Government that the Austrian Hitler be expelled from Bavaria. But the Catholic Government was afraid of "making Hitler a martyr" and left the expulsion of "undesirables" and the organization of more putsches to Hitler's discretion. In the eventful period between the two world wars every day brought new and sometimes very difficult and complex tasks and every new task found the two women ready with an inexhaustible supply of new ideas, new initiative, new elan. Their energies seemed unlimited, their nerves of steel!

In 1915 Anita Augspurg and Lida Gustava Heymann, together with Jane Addams of Hull House, Chicago; Aletta Jacobs of Holland; Rosika Schwimmer, then of Hungary; Emmeline Pethick Lawrence of England, and many other prominent women from both neutral and warring countries, went to The Hague to found the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. From then on they gave their best energies and all their time and money to this international organization. Without them the German Section could never have carried on all the work it kept up until the day when the forces of evil usurped power in March, 1933. Without them the International Executive meetings in the old "Maison Internationale" at Geneva, Switzerland, would have lacked a great deal of the creative thinking, of the fire, of the broad vision, the generosity, the initiative, the upright sincerity and originality of concept and the political action which marked its best time.

Anita Augspurg and Lida Gustava Heymann were deeply interested in the role of matriarchy—ancient and modern—in human society. They were unshakably convinced that free women have a contribution of their own to make to the world, that they ought not to imitate men's actions and reactions, but that they should allow their "creative agent" as they called it, to unfold and operate for the benefit of themselves and of the world community. For them freedom and equality of rights and opportunities for all human beings were not a distant goal but tools for daily use, for use now, in the formation and constantly higher development of human society, national and international, based on justice for every one of its elements and on peace, the twin of freedom.

(Continued on Page 86)

More Endorsements

OREN HARRIS

Member House of Representatives from Arkansas

November 24, 1944.

Since we included in our National Party Platform the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment, and no doubt many people, especially among the women of the Nation, worked diligently for our success because of that pledge, I am of the opinion that we should work for the early adoption of that Amendment.

Though I have been somewhat hesitant in definitely committing my position, due to some apprehension as to what effect it would have on our State inheritance laws, I am of the opinion that the great majority of the ladies from our state want the Equal Rights Amendment, regardless of existing favorable laws locally in this respect, and I shall work and use my very best efforts for its adoption.

Sincerely yours,

OREN HARRIS, M. C.

CIVIC AND BUSINESS FEDERATION OF WHITE PLAINS, NEW YORK

A Resolution recently passed by the Civic and Business Federation of White Plains, N. Y., after stating, in the preamble, that action on the ERA had from time to time been delayed; that women are now conscientiously and devotedly serving in every imaginable occupation; and that it is repugnant to our concept of democratic government that qualified persons should be denied the right of full and complete citizenship; expressed "complete approval and support of the proposed Constitutional Amendment reading, 'Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the U. S. or by any State on account of sex,' and that Representative Ralph A. Gamble, of the 25th District, and Senators Robert F. Wagner and James M. Mead be respectfully requested to support the ERA and to take all steps necessary looking to the adoption thereof." The Resolution was presented by Olive A. Pryor, president of the Civic and Business Federation.

CLAUDE PEPPER

United States Senator from Florida

December 18, 1944.

I am strongly in favor of the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment. I shall be glad to serve as one of the Sponsors of the Amendment in the next Senate.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE PEPPER.

SHERIDAN DOWNEY

United States Senator from California

December 18, 1944.

Let me assure you of my support of the Equal Rights Amendment when this measure is before Congress.

Sincerely yours,

SHERIDAN DOWNEY.

(Continued from Page 79)

Votes For Frenchwomen

By a recent decree, the French Provisional Government, as it now calls itself, has granted the vote to Frenchwomen, who thus have it for the first time in history. They will vote in the municipal elections next February, and in the all important national elections to be held as soon as the French prisoners are returned from Germany. This in itself amounts to a minor revolution for the political supremacy of the male sex has been one of the strongest of French traditions. The whole tendency of the famous Napoleonic code has been to strengthen the sovereignty of the *pater familias*. On this point the Emperor himself is said to have instructed the compilers of the code: "Make sure that the fathers govern their families; then I can make sure of governing the fathers." France clung to this tradition long after almost every other country in the Western World had accepted the principle of equal suffrage.

—(From the Washington Post, Oct. 23, 1944.)

A Letter To General De Gaulle

Washington, D. C.

September 14, 1944.

GENERAL CHARLES DE GAULLE,
Paris, France.

Permit me to congratulate you on granting the right of suffrage to the women of France. I happen to be reading Beard's Basic History of the United States, recently published, and I find on page 217 the following which may prove of interest:

"With the sympathy and aid of several prominent men that movement (votes for women) was formally launched by the holding of a convention at Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848. Lucretia Mott, of Philadelphia, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, of Seneca Falls, were the prime instigators of this undertaking. After a long debate the convention drafted and adopted a Declaration of Sentiments, or principles, on which to base appeals for united and nationwide action.

"Almost in the language of the Declaration of Independence, the women's declaration opened: 'When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one portion of the family of man to assume among the people of the earth a position different from that which they have hitherto occupied, but one to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes that impel them to such a course. We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and women are created equal . . .'"

My father was a Frenchman; I am an American, born in New Orleans. In 1908 I introduced in the Senate of Louisiana a bill to grant suffrage to the women of my State, but it was then ridiculed and defeated.

May you continue the moral rehabilitation of beloved France to a successful conclusion.

A well-wisher,

(Signed) HENRI LOUIS GUEYDAN.

• "The past belongs to inequality and to prejudice. The future must bring with it equal rights for all human beings through equal laws and their equal application, with special privileges to none and without relation to sex, to race or to nationality.

"We must not merely have on our lips equality under the law in all human relationships. We must have equality in our hearts, indeed, in our every outward action."

DR. JAMES BROWN SCOTT.

Is Your Subscription Paid Up?

Trade Union Women Support Equal Rights Amendment

By MOLLIE MALONEY

On Sunday, November 5th, a group of industrial women met in New York at the home of Mrs. Nora Stanton Barney. We discussed how we could help the Equal Rights Amendment. As a result, we organized ourselves as the Industrial Women's League for Equality. Our National officers are: President, Ella M. Sherwin, member International Typographical Union, A. F. L. affiliate; Vice-President, Mollie Maloney, member International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, A. F. L. affiliate; Secretary-Treasurer, Kathryn B. Withrow, member State and County Municipal Workers, C. I. O. affiliate.

Members of our National Board are: Hazel Griffiths Barker, member American Federation of Teachers, A. F. L. affiliate; Josephine Casey, Labor Organizer; Bea Don Court, member American Federation of Musicians, A. F. L. affiliate; Margaret Kerr Firth, member International Typographical Union, A. F. L. affiliate; Jennie Ling, member Meat Cutters' Union, A. F. L. affiliate; Mary Markajani, member United Aircraft, Automobile and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, C. I. O. affiliate; Margaret Murphy, member International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, A. F. L. affiliate; Mary Murray, member Transport Workers Union, C. I. O. affiliate; Clara Scott, member International Typographical Union, A. F. L. affiliate; Georgia Storms, United Automobile Workers, C. I. O. affiliate; Claire Liggett, member International Typographical Union, A. F. L. affiliate.

We believe that the Equal Rights Amendment represents the only chance women in the United States have of getting the full protection of the national Constitution. We know that women in industry need the protection of the Constitution on an equal basis with men.

The urgent need for the Equal Rights Amendment is shown by what is happening at this moment in Connecticut. Due to the ten o'clock law, applying to women but not to their male competitors, many women employed as entertainers have lost their jobs. In consequence, they have also lost their savings and their instruments. They thought at first that they were exempt from the operation of the ten o'clock law, but found that the exemption applied only to cooks and waitresses. And anyway the exemption was only for the duration. After the war, if this law continues in force, cooks, waitresses, and entertainers in Connecticut will all be out, as they can't work after ten o'clock.

We are urging Congress to pass the Equal Rights Amendment so as to save women from such indignities and injustices. Congress has been misled by a lot of uplifters who don't know the facts. We women who are barred by law from earning our living after ten o'clock are just as moral and well-behaved as nurses and telephone operators, who are allowed to work all night. It is all a lot of jealousy to keep women out of well paid jobs.

I myself have been a member of Local 43-36, Bindery Women's Union, affiliated with the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders and the American Federation of Labor, for 36 years. Our membership has never been quizzed by the officers of the A. F. L. in regard to the Equal Rights Amendment. The same obtains with regard to women members of the C. I. O. Neither the officers of the A. F. L. nor of the C. I. O. have consulted their women members. What authority then have these master minds to come out in print against the Equal Rights Amendment, trying to give the public the idea that we women members of their unions have been consulted?

THE INDUSTRIAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE FOR EQUALITY

Room 616, 220 West 42d Street, New York

Invites all Union Working Women and all Unorganized Working Women to join our organization to put the Equal Rights Amendment through Congress and secure its ratification by the various States.

When the Equal Rights Amendment has been passed by Congress and been ratified by three-fourths of the States, it becomes part of the Constitution of the United States. The Supreme Court has decided that women do not now come under the protection of the Constitution. It will then become necessary for each State to amend all laws which do not give the same rights and the same protection to its men citizens and to its women citizens. The advantage this will give to working men and women is primarily its effect on labor legislation.

Under existing "protective legislation" for women in various States, men workers "scab" on women workers by taking jobs at lower wages than the rate set by law for women, and at longer hours than the maximum hours set by law for women. This is NOT because men want to be unfair, but is because the State has neglected to extend its protection to men. This condition MUST NOT be carried over into the post-war world!

"The "protective laws" for women are now in abeyance because of the war. If these laws are permitted to come into effect again at the end of the war, women by the thousands will be displaced by men, just as they have been in the past whenever a new protective law has been enacted.

The Equal Rights Amendment is the instrument through which American women can obtain the right to share equally with men in the right to a job, and American men can share equally with women in protection against low wages and long hours of work.

Asks Senate To Pass Amendment

INDUSTRIAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE FOR EQUALITY

November 25, 1944.

To the Members of the United States Senate:

Certain officials of the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. claim to speak for their women members in opposing the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution.

We wish to point out that they are expressing their personal views. They have never consulted their women members in the matter. Many of their members—both men and women—from coast to coast—favor this Amendment.

Our organization of industrial women urgently desire the passage of the Amendment in order to facilitate the equalizing of the labor laws for the equal protection of men and women workers.

We are patriotic enough to know that our country cannot continue its industrial leadership and its high standard of living unless it utilizes the talents and services of all its citizens. This cannot be done with special restrictions on women's labor.

We call upon you in the name of commonsense, patriotism and justice to pass without delay the Equal Rights Amendment, giving to us industrial women the protection of the Constitution of the United States.

Very truly yours,

ELLA M. SHERWIN, President,
Member, Intl. Typographical Union (A. F. L. Affiliate.)

Arizona Women Back Equal Rights Amendment

A NEW center of strength for the Equal Rights Amendment was developed during the month of November, when Anita Pollitzer, member of the National Executive Committee of the National Woman's Party, and Chairman of the New York City Committee, visited this state.

During the course of a series of excellent meetings in Phoenix, Tucson, and Flagstaff, pledges of support and continued interest were received from the Arizona Senators and Congressmen. This means that the Arizona delegation in Congress is now 100% back of the Amendment.

The campaign opened on November the fourth with a meeting in Phoenix, at the Adams Hotel, arranged overnight upon Miss Pollitzer's arrival, by the leaders of Phoenix women's groups. Miss Harriet Jean Oliver, Legislative Chairman of the Arizona Business and Professional Women's Clubs, presided. Mrs. A. G. McAllister was asked, on behalf of the group, to urge Arizona's Congressional leaders to do their utmost in behalf of the Amendment.

Interest in the subject was so great that Miss Pollitzer was invited to address several meetings, among them a Dinner-meeting of the Phoenix Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, and a Luncheon of the Soroptimist Club. At all meetings support was given and resolutions passed.

Then came a week-end in Flagstaff, where Mrs. Estelle Bjerg gave a delightful tea, at which Miss Pollitzer set forth the Congressional situation for Equal Rights before women in that part of the state. The following day Miss Pollitzer was invited to address the Woman's Club of Flagstaff. This group unanimously passed a resolution in support of the Amendment and of immediate Congressional action, offered by Mrs. Nancy Lindemann, Legislative Chairman of the Club.

In Tucson, Miss Pollitzer met with women leaders, and spoke at a meeting arranged by Mrs. Edward McQuade at the Tucson Chamber of Commerce.

All of this activity culminated in an enthusiastic meeting at the Adams Hotel, Phoenix, on November seventeenth, attended by representative women from various parts of Arizona. At this meeting an Arizona State Committee of the National Woman's Party was formed to cooperate in the nation-wide campaign to win equality under the law, and in particular to pass the Equal Rights Amendment.

Mrs. Estelle Blair Bjerg of Flagstaff, one of the speakers at the meeting, and long a devoted worker for Equal Rights, was named State Chairman. Four

Vice-Chairmen were chosen: Mrs. Horace Evans of Winslow, President of the Arizona Federation of Women's Clubs, who came to Phoenix for the meeting; Miss Esta Imler, State President, Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Phoenix; Mrs. Edward McQuade, club leader of Tucson, and Miss C. Louise Boehringer, Phoenix, former member of the Arizona Legislature, and the first woman elected to Public Office in Arizona.

Committee Chairmen chosen for the state organization were: Public Relations, Mrs. A. G. McAllister; Speakers' Committee, Mrs. Monroe C. Rand; Program Committee, Mrs. Marie Good; Membership, Mrs. Opal Bowman; Equal Rights Magazine, Mrs. Rose C. MacLaren; Committee on Pioneers, Mrs. Gladys M. Bagley; Radio, Mrs. Grace B. Holt; Secretary, Miss Gertrude M. Converse; Treasurer, Mrs. Nina Keen.

A state-wide Advisory Committee of prominent Arizona women has been formed to aid the work. Accepting membership on this Committee are: Mrs. Alice Brainard, Tucson; Miss Pauline Bates Brown, Phoenix; Miss Lenna Burges, Tucson; Miss Nellie Bush, Parker; Mrs. F. G. Gold, Flagstaff; Mrs. Lulu Hall, Kingman; Mrs. Angela Hammer, Phoenix; Miss Annie Campbell Jones, Phoenix; Mrs. Nancy T. Lindemann, Flagstaff; Miss Lorna Lockwood, Phoenix; Mrs. Margaret E. McAllister, Tucson; Mrs. Bertha Sanford Miller, Tucson; Miss Harriet Jean Oliver, Phoenix; Mrs. Bess McDole Prather, Casa Grande; Mrs. Margaret Adams Rockwell, Phoenix; Mrs. Elizabeth Siebenthal, Tucson; Mrs. W. P. Stuart, Democratic State Committeewoman, Phoenix; and Dr. Josie Trinkle, Tucson.

"Earnest work has begun in Arizona to acquaint the women of the state with the need for the immediate passage of the Equal Rights Amendment," declared Estelle Blair Bjerg, State Chairman, in beginning her state campaign. "Arizona has a proud equality tradition. The first legislative session after Arizona became a State granted suffrage to women. Our entire delegation in Congress has promised to aid the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment, which declares for equality under the law. We will now begin educational work so that Arizona will be the first state to ratify."

The great welcome given Anita Pollitzer throughout the state and the interest of women in her message is indeed heartening. As she expressed it: "In the days of suffrage, women of the East and the South appealed to women of the West, who helped to win the passage of the Federal Suffrage Amendment. Once again women of Arizona are showing that they will respond."

Brilliant Meeting At "Pickfair"

On October 22nd, Miss Anita Pollitzer, Chairman, New York City Committee, N. W. P., started for California to speak at the Congressional Tea, honoring the presidents of organizations which have endorsed the Equal Rights Amendment. This Tea was held at "Pickfair," the beautiful home of Mary Pickford, in Beverly Hills, on October 28th from 2:30 to 4:30 p. m. The National Woman's Party, assisted by Miss Pickford, the School Women's Council and the Business Women's Legislative Council of California, were the hostesses. An audience of 1,100 women attended.

A full account of this brilliant meeting, illustrated by pictures, will appear in the January issue of EQUAL RIGHTS.

Iowa

Mrs. Mazie Stokes, of Davenport, Iowa, member of the Iowa State Committee of the N. W. P., has spoken before the Republican Woman's Club and the P. T. A. Group. She also attended the meeting at Clear Lake, Iowa, when Mrs. Ethel Ernest Murrell, Ch., Natl. Speakers' Bureau of the N. W. P., was the principal speaker. Mrs. Stokes reported the indefatigable work of Mrs. Lucretia M. Hayden, our Iowa State Chairman, and spoke of the enthusiasm she found everywhere in Iowa for the ERA. Mrs. Stokes' talk is entitled: "Are We Part-Time Citizens?"

Also from Iowa comes the report that Mrs. Eugene Henely, of Grinnell, Iowa, presented the facts about the ERA to the Iowa Press Women at their meeting in Des Moines on November 18th. The Iowa Press Women recommended support of the Amendment to the National Federation of Press Women. The two groups held a two-day "war conference", concluding with an official meeting of the National Board on Sunday morning the 19th. Mrs. Henely is the legislative chairman of the National Federation. Mrs. Henely is also the past president of the Iowa State Federation of Women's Clubs.

Tour Of Jeannette Marks

STARTING from her home at Westport, Essex County, N. Y., on Sunday, October 8th, Miss Jeannette Marks, our N. Y. State Chairman, arrived in Buffalo the following day and made the Statler Hotel her Headquarters, to begin an intensive speaking tour on the Equal Rights Amendment and the need for its passage.

Monday afternoon at 3:30 Miss Marks spoke over WKBW on "The American Creed and Women." In the evening at 6:30 at the Twentieth Century Club, in Buffalo, a dinner was given under the auspices of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Buffalo and the Western New York Branch of the N. W. P. to celebrate "National Business Women's Week." On this occasion Miss Marks, who was the principal speaker, addressed the audience on the subject "On Account of Sex." Tuesday noon, October 10th, at Lockport, before the Zonta Club, at the Y. W. C. A., Miss Marks spoke on the topic "The American Creed." Following the address Miss Marks journeyed to Syracuse, where on Wednesday evening she spoke to the English Club, at Syracuse University. On Thursday morning at 9 a. m., Miss Marks spoke to the class of Dr. Marguerite Fisher, her subject being: "On Account of Sex." At noon of the same day Miss Marks spoke at a luncheon on the same subject. Miss Marks, a gifted writer and speaker, holds her audience by the import of her message, delivered in faultless style.

The evening meeting on October 9th, at the Twentieth Century Club, was attended by over one hundred women. Besides the members of the B. & P. Women's Club of Buffalo, and the Western New York Branch of the N. W. P., members of the Railway Women's Group; of the Quota Club; of the N. Y. Federation of Women's Clubs; Inter-Club Council of Western N. Y.; B. & P. Women's Club of Lockport and Tonawandas; Western N. Y. Library Association and members of other prominent women's organizations of Western New York attended. Mrs. Harry Zolitsch, president of the B. & P. Women's Club of Buffalo, presided. Miss Edna Briggs, Legislative Chairman, introduced the speaker. At the Zonta Club meeting in Lockport, on Oct. 10th, Mrs. T. Bernard Rooney, President, presided and Miss Dorothy Summey, program chairman, introduced the speaker.

Below are given excerpts of "The American Creed and Women," by Jeannette Marks:

The American Creed And Women

The American woman's is a birthright freedom. She is proud of the men and the women; she is proud of the American Creed and of the great history which have made America a symbol of freedom. Hers is no necessity to ask other nations to bring liberty to her. Supposedly freedom was hers by birth as a pioneer woman in a free country—free both in fact and in principle from the days of the James River Colony and Plymouth Rock down to the present day with its Atlantic Charter, its Four Freedoms and its gigantic defense of the principle of liberty for all mankind. With the passing of the pioneer period by what misadventure a separation was made between mankind and womankind, and woman was deprived economically and legally of equal rights is, as Rudyard Kipling would say, "another story," and one too long to tell today.

Once upon a time back in Civil War days, the women who were leading the struggle for freedom for women—Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Lucy Stone and others—stepped aside for the freedom of the Negro, for they were told that this was the "Negroes' hour." Not all of

them believed that the freedom of women—numerically a larger group—was really less important. Some of them were convinced that the Negro would have a better chance to secure justice if women were first to secure freedom from all the legal, economic and social disabilities which bound as with chains women as well as slaves.

The parallelism between the fight to free the slaves and the struggle for the emancipation of women is in history and in fact so close, that the conditions today as the Negro is again reaching a climax in the battle to free his race from discrimination, are a danger signal. The defense ideology built up around the granting of equal constitutional status to women is practically identical with the defense ideology built up about slavery. Into these struggles of the Negroes and of women play identical discriminations: the inferiority of the Negro and the inferiority of women, the small brains of both, the belief still current or latent that both groups are better off without too much education, the emphasis on the "place" of the woman, and of the keeping to that place, as well as the emphasis on the "Negroes' place," the attempts to prevent each group from earning a living along certain lines and from advancement, and finally discriminations in the matter of "pay." As far as the Negro is concerned, the New Deal Administration has completed some of the work left undone by the Civil War but as far as women are concerned women have met with unreasoning opposition from the New Deal—an opposition unrelieved by the pacifiers handed out in a few conspicuous posts given to women. * * *

Trade Unions over the world have been used by men "to keep women out of competition." Now again the attempt is being made to roll women aside. In the present struggle centering about the Democracy of the Sexes, among men the leaders are not Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln. They are Philip Murray and Sidney Hillman. The leaders among the women are not Lucretia Mott and Susan B. Anthony. They are Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Eva Lapin. And in that difference is to be found both the warning and the danger.

Our American Creed condemns discrimination of whatsoever sort and commits us to Equality. The very key words and phrases of our Creed ring the changes on freedom for all: "land of the free," "cradle of liberty," "home of democracy," "land of opportunity," the American Flag symbolizing the "equality of all men," freedom of speech, freedom of religion, racial tolerance. Except, however, for Mr. Wallace, how many men are writing about the "democracy of the sexes"? Our Creed is still in flux, still being formulated. Is equal rights for women to become a part of that Creed? It is not at present a part of that Creed except in those good intentions with which proverbially Hell is paved. Over one thousand laws discriminating against women still stand on the Statute Books of the States of the United States. Every State in the Union, including New York, has those laws which are hostile to opportunity for women.

It is not always inequality which is at fault: it is rather the lack of opportunity for women and for Negroes which brings about certain forms and aspects of inequality. In a sense the demand for political equality was satisfied by the 19th Amendment giving women the right to vote, and supposedly with it equal opportunity politically. I said, however, "in a sense," for actually women have not achieved even political equality! Women have merely taken *their* place—a place still cursed by alleged inferiority—in the Republican and Democratic Parties. In practical politics they are in no way receiving the posts and rewards given full-fledged party members. In our own New York State a Winifred Stanley, a Jane Todd, a Ruth Miner as Mr. Dewey's Deputy Executive Secretary of State, a Mary Donlon, are merely a few of the exceptions which prove the rule of omission.

If there are enough of us, however, who are convinced that women should lead a fuller and a freer life; if there are enough of us who believe that the organization of our human society should be better than it is, should be capable of preventing wars and of developing peace; and if we as women can be clear-eyed and unvindictive enough to wish with all our hearts to help the very men who in their male-concentrated governments have made such a tragic mess of the world, then whatever the cost temporarily, women will gain equality. Those who believe in our American Creed will never falter, for whatever the struggle and its cost to get freedom for women, biologically that struggle by the liberation into Government of those endowments which make even the humblest woman great; regard for human life, endurance, the practical abilities involved in "housekeeping" for the nation as well as the home, patience, sense of responsibility to the race and, greatest of all, Mother Love, are destined to strengthen and to complete our American Creed.

"For Women Only"

THE CASE AGAINST PROTECTIVE LEGISLATION

A Powerful Argument From Far-away Australia

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that those who demand equal status and equal safeguards for men and women whole-heartedly welcome regulations which protect and safeguard the industrial worker. We realize that Factory Legislation has revolutionized conditions in industry during the last century, while many improvements have yet to be effected.

But we challenge the view that it IS "protection" to regulate the work of women by placing special restrictions upon them which do not apply to men. Such regulation does not benefit women and it does not "protect" them. On the contrary, it debars a woman from many well-paid jobs and lowers her status in industry. We believe that the only true protection is that in which conditions of work, the pay and the hours depend on the kind of work performed and not on the sex of the worker.

As is the case today, in the last war women took over "men's jobs" and were praised for their efficiency and skill, President Wilson declaring that the war could not have been fought successfully but for the services of women in every sphere, even "on the very skirts and edges of the battle itself". And yet, when it was ended, the problem as men saw it was not "How can we plan so that there be work for all?" but "How can we keep women out of 'our' jobs?" And one of their solutions was Special Protection of Women in Industry.

The International Labour Office adopted the Night Work Convention recommending that women be prohibited from working in industry between 10 p. m. and 5 a. m. The fact that women had worked at night in a great many industries during the war, without injuring their health or morals, was not considered. The night shift was—as a rule—the highest paid shift, therefore it must be reserved for men. Inevitably, the adoption of the Washington Convention by a large number of countries resulted in many women losing their employment in industry and being forced into lower paid jobs. Among these were women who had worked in newspaper offices on the reporting and mechanical staffs for a number of years. It is ironical to note that women working as cleaners in the same offices were allowed to continue with their night work, and if malnutrition through unemployment subsequently sent these "protected" women to hospital, they were attended in the night hours by women nurses!

After the Night Work Convention came the prohibition of the employment of women in dangerous trades. Here again, we whole-heartedly approve of protective legislation for workers, realizing that many grave accidents are caused by machinery. But danger from machinery is not peculiar to one sex—rather is it attendant on circumstances—crowding of machinery, slippery floors, bad lighting, unsuitable clothes, too long hours, insufficient rest-stops, etc. The safeguarding of the worker against these conditions is the kind of protection we favor, believing, as we do, that the lives of all workers—male and female—are valuable.

The exclusion of women from night-work or from trades and processes said to be dangerous, in reality protects men, by reserving many trades as monopolies for the male worker. For a woman, it limits her chances of employment, lowers her status and relegates her to the bottom of the wage market. The gravest danger a woman can face is poverty, and the best protection she can have is well paid work and good conditions. —(From *Woman's Cause*, Editor, Vivienne Newson, 61 Market St., Sydney, Australia.)

Careers For Women In Banking And Finance

By DORCAS CAMPBELL

(Published by Dutton and Company)

Reviewed by Anita Pollitzer, Member National Council, National Woman's Party.

Dorcas Campbell sounds the note to which she keys her book, "Careers for Women in Banking and Finance," in the dedication, when she speaks of women's opportunity "to serve and to advance in the ranks of banking."

Clearly and cleanly she cuts her words, and because of her background, her experience, and way of citing evidence, she presents the picture in a non-causey, non-controversial way. For instance, she writes:

"Today, women, like men, want to capture security even in a changing world struggle. In a world of tensions and conflicts they, too, probe the future looking for assurance for themselves.

"Women are on the march in banking and finance!" she tells us, "America's 15,000 banks are now being manned by women in increasing numbers."

It is a sane book—the kind of reading one cannot put down; a challenge and an incentive to women, interested in a financial career, an informational book for all, and a MUST for students in the field of banking.

Madame President

(Continued from Page 80)

Women can meet realities and are proving it every day. They can take things better sometimes than men, certainly better now than their mothers could. I have been teaching for over 25 years. I was told, when I started, that if I wanted to teach sociology I always had to have smelling salts, ammonia and other restoratives ready in my desk—and I needed them, too, then. I haven't had anyone faint in one of my classes for ten years. And women are doing fine sociological field work besides.

"There are eight to ten times as many individual achievements among women now as there were a generation ago. There are also eight to ten times as many women criminals in our penal institutions. But that is less due to fundamental differences than to changing traditions and educations. There is less chance for men to change. Look at what women have accomplished in the field of war work, in any field to which they have turned. They are just getting an opportunity to show their variability, what they can or can not do." * * *

—From *The Baltimore Sun*, Oct. 29, 1944.

In Memoriam

(Continued from Page 81)

They always remained members of the World Woman's Party and shortly before the outbreak of the second World War, Lida Gustava Heymann came to Geneva, from Zurich, to speak at an evening rally held on the grounds of the World Woman's Party, on the shore of the beautiful Lake Geneva.

Last year death came to the two unique personalities, to these truly integral internationalists and "good Europeans". In taking leave of them we took leave of an entire epoch, which had formed us and in which we had our roots, of that epoch of liberation, of emancipation from legal, social, political and intellectual disabilities, of bitter fight for equality of sex, creed, class and race. Only when our generation takes up for the second time the work of rebuilding from ruins, physical and moral, will it fully realize how much it owes to the last two great women of pre-Hitler Germany—Anita Augspurg and Lida Gustava Heymann.

RECEIPTS — NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, October 1 to November 30, 1944

Finance Chairman..... Florence A. Armstrong

Treasurer..... Laura Berrien

CONTRIBUTIONS AND MEMBERSHIP FEES

Los Angeles National Woman's Party Branch, Los Angeles Schoolwomen's Council, and Los Angeles Business Women's Legislative Council, Proceeds from tea at home of Mary Pickford, California.....	754.00
Mrs. Elizabeth Rogers, N. Y.....	200.00
Dr. Florence A. Armstrong, Iowa.....	100.00
Mrs. Elizabeth Kent, Calif.....	60.00
Mrs. Anna Kelton Wiley, D. C.....	50.00
Mrs. Ethel Ernest Murrell, Fla.....	31.13
Los Angeles Branch National Woman's Party, Enrollment Memberships.....	30.50
Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, Pa.....	30.00
Miss Dorcas Campbell, N. Y.....	25.00
Miss Eva L. Cole, Calif.....	25.00
Mrs. Jane Norman Smith, Vt.....	25.00
South Florida Branch, National Woman's Party.....	25.00
Mrs. Clara Snell Wolfe, Ohio.....	25.00
Mrs. Gertrude Gates, D. C.....	20.00
Miss Grace B. Rosenthal, Calif.....	20.00
Miss Agnes E. Wells, Ind.....	20.00
Mrs. Lucy Rice Winkler, Calif.....	20.00
Mrs. Elizabeth Forbes, Md.....	15.00
Mrs. Lucy Cooper Shaw, Md.....	15.00
Iowa Branch, National Woman's Party, Enrollment Memberships.....	11.00
Anonymous, Mo.....	10.00
Mrs. Florence C. Bacon, Calif.....	10.00
Dr. Emily Dunning Barringer, Conn.....	10.00
Mrs. Edwin F. Bennet, Wyo.....	10.00
Mrs. Grace Binder, Ind.....	10.00
Dr. Marguerite Fisher, N. Y.....	10.00
Mrs. Maude L. Franchot, N. Y.....	10.00
Miss Jane Grant, N. Y.....	10.00
Mrs. Rena M. Green, Texas.....	10.00
Miss Florence Kennard, Md.....	10.00
Miss Hilda A. L. Kratsch, Md.....	10.00
Mrs. Annette J. Roberts, Wisc.....	10.00
Miss Mildred Roberts, Calif.....	10.00
Miss Iva Sellar, Pa.....	10.00
Miss Ella M. Sherwin, N. Y.....	10.00
Mrs. Helen F. Topping, D. C.....	10.00
Mrs. Helen Wetzel, N. J.....	10.00
Miss Mary Winsor, Pa.....	9.00
Mrs. Dorothy Shipley Granger, Md.....	9.00
Mrs. F. B. Pott, Mont.....	6.50
Mrs. R. Louise Ball, Md.....	5.00
Miss Mary L. Barber, Mich.....	5.00
Miss Katherine D. Blake, N. Y.....	5.00
Miss Frances M. Boss, N. Y.....	5.00
Mrs. Ellen Phelps Crump, Miss.....	5.00
Mrs. Edith S. Eckert, Md.....	5.00
Miss Edna Grimes, Ind.....	5.00
Miss Amy Guest, N. Y.....	5.00
Miss Virginia R. Howard, Fla.....	5.00
Mrs. Katherine Jones, Mass.....	5.00
Mrs. Jeaselyn Odell MacDonald, Wisc.....	5.00
Miss Inez B. Madsen, Minn.....	5.00
Mrs. Elizabeth D. Marriott, Mo.....	5.00
Mrs. H. Frederica Olcott, D. C.....	5.00
Mrs. Abbie Owen, Va.....	5.00
Miss Olive Pryor, N. Y.....	5.00
Miss Isabel H. Sarber, Calif.....	5.00
Mrs. Almira Sweeten, Md.....	5.00

Mrs. Mary Church Terrell, D. C.....	5.00
Mrs. Amelia H. Walker, Md.....	5.00
Mrs. Kate G. Winston, Texas.....	5.00
Miss Marjorie Varner, Fla.....	4.00
Mrs. Jane W. Bustard, D. C.....	3.00
Mrs. William H. M. Slemmons, Fla.....	3.00
Miss Edith S. Tyler, Conn.....	3.00
Mrs. E. A. Ruggles, D. C.....	2.75
Miss Rosa Baldwin, Md.....	2.00
Mrs. Irene Bedford, Minn.....	2.00
Miss Vyvyan Donner, N. Y.....	2.00
Miss Theodosia Keeler, Ill.....	2.00
Mrs. Charles H. Metcalf, Mich.....	2.00
Mrs. Jeannette Parker, N. Y.....	2.00
Ruth M. Roach, Tenn.....	2.00
Mrs. Lena Baer, Ind.....	1.75
Baltimore Branch, National Woman's Party Enrollment Memberships.....	1.75
Mrs. Mary Vashti Funk, Ohio.....	1.75
Mrs. Meta Grace Keebler, D. C.....	1.75
Mrs. Harriet N. Leary, Texas.....	1.75
Mrs. Ann Aston, D. C.....	1.00
Miss Christine Bull, Conn.....	1.00
Miss Evelyn Carrington, Texas.....	1.00
Mrs. Marie Costella, Fla.....	1.00
Mrs. E. N. Fales, D. C.....	1.00
Miss Idah S. Foster, D. C.....	1.00
Mrs. Christine Kefauver, N. Y.....	1.00
Miss Clara M. Klippel, Ky.....	1.00
Miss Mildred Maroney, D. C.....	1.00
Mrs. Edward N. Mudd, Minn.....	1.00
Miss Hildegard Swenson, Calif.....	1.00
Miss Gladys Webster, D. C.....	1.00
Mrs. Katherine A. Williamson, N. C.....	1.00
Mrs. Walter H. Ziegler, Tenn.....	1.00

Total contributions and membership fees.....\$1,854.63

ENROLLMENT FEES

Mrs. Decima Allen, Calif.; Miss Sue Baer, Ind.; Miss Bessie Baher, D. C.; Mrs. Digby Baltzell, Pa.; Mrs. Leona Barritz, D. C.; Miss Lucy Branham, Del.; Mrs. John Branham, Fla.; Mrs. Anita Wellets Burnham, Ill.; Mrs. May Cook, Calif.; Mrs. Viola Craig, Ind.; Mrs. Frank B. Cuff, N. Y.; Dr. Ethel B. Dietrich, N. Y.; Miss France M. Dougwell, Calif.; Mrs. Florence H. Freidell, N. Y.; Mrs. John M. Garner, Calif.; Mrs. Annette Hammer, N. Y.; Mrs. Joseph W. Henderson, Pa.; Mrs. Thomas F. Hodge, Pa.; Mrs. Ethel Hunt, D. C.; Mrs. Sally Marlon, D. C.; Mrs. George O. Nelson, Calif.; Mrs. Vernon L. Owen, Calif.; Miss Eloise Sanchez, D. C.; Miss Mabel Sawyer, D. C.; Miss Mary E. Sheehan, N. Y.; Alice M. Soule, N. Y.; Miss Myrtle Starr, D. C.; Winifred Thorpe, N. Y.; Rita M. Welley, N. Y.; Mrs. W. E. Yucom, Md.	
---	--

Total enrollment fees.....\$ 7.50

OTHER RECEIPTS

Income from Investment and Endowment Fund.....	\$1,500.00
Rent of rooms at National Headquarters.....	909.41
Subscriptions to Equal Rights.....	367.30
Sale of Literature and Post Cards.....	17.80
Miscellaneous Receipts (including refunds).....	32.29

GRAND TOTAL, Receipts.....\$4,688.93

Mrs. Murrell Achieves Victory

It will be recalled that Mrs. Ethel Ernest Murrell, of Miami, Florida, the Chairman of the N.W.P. Florida Committee, after many years of continuous effort, won a battle waged on behalf of the married women of Florida. On June 4th, 1943, the Governor of Florida signed a Married Woman's Act which gave married women the right to do with their property everything a married man can do with his. From the position of the most backward state in the Union, Florida immediately became one of the most progressive states. Mrs. Murrell's work was largely educational. She organized groups which helped spread the gospel of freedom. She wrote newspaper articles, talked over the radio, swung the Florida State Bar Association behind the idea and headed the Committee of the Bar Association which rewrote the law. She herself spoke in every town in the State of Florida over a period of years.

Hence it is welcome news to read in the Miami Herald of December 9th the following story:

WOMEN'S PROPERTY RIGHTS LAW UPHELD BY HIGH COURT

Constitutionality of the 1943 "Married Women's Act" was upheld Friday by Florida's supreme court, according to a tele-

gram received by Mrs. Ethel Ernest Murrell, Miami attorney who led a 12-year campaign for enactment of such a measure.

"This is the greatest milestone in the history of woman's rights in Florida since this state switched from Spanish law to English common law," Mrs. Murrell said. "Now there can be no more argument about the constitutionality of the act."

It empowers married women "to do everything with their property that a married man can do with his," as Mrs. Murrell put it. Neither men nor women who are married can sell or mortgage property without the signature of their spouse, she added, but married women now can make binding contracts, give valid promissory notes, sue and be sued and control their own property.

The 1943 legislature adopted the act after the long campaign in which Mrs. Murrell argued that Florida law previously classed married women along with idiots and children so far as their legal rights were concerned.

The supreme court ruling came in an appeal taken by Mrs. Emma E. Taylor and her husband, C. A., of Orlando, Fla., in a suit brought by A. T. Dorsey, real estate broker, to collect a commission for finding a buyer for property owned by Mrs. Taylor.

One of the contentions in the appeal was that Mrs. Taylor, as a married woman, could not make a binding contract, and the 1943 law authorizing a married woman to do so was unconstitutional.

Notified of this contention, Mrs. Murrell filed a brief as "amica curiae" in support of the constitutionality of the act.

A Feminist Thinks It Over

By ALMA LUTZ

JUL 2 1947

Equal Rights Under Law Not A Swindle

OPPPOSITION to the Equal Rights Amendment has taken a new turn. Hard-pressed finding arguments against the Amendment, two otherwise intelligent organizations have frantically pulled out of their hats the subject of rape.

"Would women under the Equal Rights Amendment," asks one of these organizations in its bulletin, "have laws protecting them from rape?" The other organization in its magazine, after calling attention to the dangers lurking in the Amendment, asks, "Should rape be punishable by law?" implying that the Amendment would wipe out laws punishing rape.

These questions are ludicrous, but at the same time appalling, because of their sophistry, and are a perfect example of distorted thinking. Obviously neither of these organizations has much confidence in the intelligence and good common sense of our Courts which interpret law.

The Equal Rights Amendment would not interfere with the punishment of rape. Rape is a crime, and rape would continue to be dealt with as crime. The effect of the Amendment on laws dealing with crime would be equal punishment of all persons who commit the same criminal acts, but it would not prevent rating as crime, acts which only one sex is capable of committing.

It would almost seem as if these organizations had failed to read the text of the Amendment in their anxiety to stir up opposition. One of them has thought up four more questions which would not be worth noticing, except that, if they are glibly repeated often enough, the unthinking may believe them. These questions, framed to suggest what this organization wants you to think will happen if the Equal Rights Amendment is adopted, are:

"Should a pregnant wife, deserted by her husband, have no recourse to law?"

"Should a middle-aged woman, whose husband divorces her to marry again, have no legal right to alimony?"

"Should a wife and mother have no legal right to support from her husband?"

"Should widows be deprived of their husbands' Social Security benefits?"

The Equal Rights Amendment would, of course, in no way deprive a pregnant wife, deserted by her husband, of recourse to law. Instead it would tend to give an invalid husband recourse to law if he were deserted by his wife.

The Equal Rights Amendment would not take alimony away from a middle-aged woman, divorced by her husband, so that he could marry again. Instead it would lead to the requirement that husband and wife be treated equally in the matter of support by the other spouse on dissolution of marriage or during divorce proceedings. Already in 13 States either husband or wife may be allowed alimony at the discretion of the Court.

The Equal Rights Amendment would not deprive a wife or mother of the legal support of her husband.

Baltimore, Maryland

The first meeting of the 1944-'45 season of the Baltimore Branch of the N. W. P. was a luncheon meeting at the Stafford Hotel, Oct. 4th. Mrs. Mamie Florence Bonner, President, presided. The speaker of the day, presented by the Program Chairman, Mrs. Geo. E. Halsey, was Miss Olive Pryor, president of the Civic & Business Federation of White Plains, N. Y. Miss Pryor is a member of the White Plains Chamber of Commerce, one of the founders of the P. T. A., a musician and teacher of music, and a woman who has had a long career in feminism. Miss Pryor's topic was "Politics and the Equal Rights Amendment." Among other things she said: "To keep young in mind one must join the NWP." After a tribute to Margaret Brent, she spoke of the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848, when the vote for women was first demanded. "In spite of the indifference of the two political parties, women finally won the vote in 1920, but one thousand discriminatory laws against women still exist. Women must use the franchise and concentrate on the passage of the ERA," she said. In conclusion she said "We must awaken every woman in the country to the discriminations still existing. The 'I' of man must be replaced by the 'We', meaning men and women. Women, too, are entitled to 'Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness.'"

Mrs. Dorothy Shipley Granger, Vice-President of the Branch, paid tribute to Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, for the masterly strategy she employed at the Chicago Democratic Convention.

At a meeting of the B. & P. Council of the NWP. of Baltimore, held at The Garden Tea Room, in Baltimore, Md., on Oct. 11, 1944, a resolution was sent to the Maryland Senators, the Honorable Millard E. Tydings and George L. Radcliffe, thanking them and commending them for their untiring efforts on behalf of the ERA and urging them to use all their influence to secure the passage of the Amendment in this session of Congress. The Resolution was signed by Mrs. Charlotte R. Davis, Corresponding Secretary, B. & P. Women's Council of the NWP.

Instead it's effect would be to require that husbands and wives be treated equally in regard to their responsibility for the support of the other spouse and children. This is now the case in one-third of our States, and will be more important than ever as disabled War veterans come home and have to depend to some extent at least upon their wives for the support of their families. One of the opposing organizations frankly states that it would be unfair and unsound to make wives equally responsible with husbands for support of the family, apparently overlooking the fact that the work of women in the home—the housework, cooking, canning, sewing, and even nursing—have been contributing through the years as much as the husband's wage to the support of the family.

The Equal Rights Amendment would of course not deprive widows of their husbands' Social Security benefits. Instead its effect would be adjustment of the law so that widowers would receive their wives' Social Security benefits.

The old argument that the Equal Rights Amendment will destroy our pattern of family life has been dusted off again by the opposition, and displayed, as it was when women first demanded education, when they began to earn money, and when they asked for the vote. It does not frighten those who understand that the noble fundamentals of family life survive changes and develop as society itself improves.

Instead of facing the basic issue of the Equal Rights Amendment which would give women equality of rights under the law, thus lifting them at last out of the confusion and humiliation of common-law interpretation of women's status, these opposing organizations repudiate it under the epithet of "gold brick." Such a blanket condemnation in itself should arouse suspicion. A "gold brick" is a swindle. No other group of citizens, struggling for equal rights under the law, have ever found these rights, when won, to be a swindle. No more will women.

